DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 800 CS 001 520

TITLE	Reading in Virginia: 1973-1974.
INSTITUTION	Virginia State Reading Association.
PUB DATE	Mar 74
NOTE	45p.; Virginia Reading Association is an affiliate of the International Reading Association
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Developmental Reading; Elementary Secondary Education; *Reading; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Research
IDENTIFIERS	Virginia

ABSTRACT

This issue of "Reading in Virginia" is intended to provide educators with information on topics related to reading instruction. The contents include: "Look, Move, Read," which discusses a reading and perceptual motor efficiency program designed to correct reading difficulties; "Teaching Reading in Virginia: Some Observations," which reports on one individual's observations in over 200 classrooms; "The Intellectual Functioning of Corrective Readers," which is a study concerned with the intellectual levels of corrective readers; "A Reading Folk Tale...?" which discusses the reading program in the Roanoke County School System; "Reading Improvement--It's Evarybody's Business in the Richmond Public Schools," which looks at preparation of staff, assessment of pupil needs, availability of reading materials, and services of curriculum specialists; "Renovation=Rewards," which discusses the renovation of a 1930 school house; "Goochland County Reading Notes," which discusses individualizing in content areas and parent involvement; "VIP Arrives in Norfolk," which discusses the Virginia Inner-City Project; and "I Believe I Can Read," which outlines a reading project intended to increase reading levels, instruct parents, and provide inservice training. (WR)

ED 099800

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

READING IN VIRGINIA: 1973-1974

A publication of the Virginia
State Reading Association

Volume II, #1, March, 1974

CS 001 520

PAST PRESIDENTS
VIRGINIA STATE READING ASSOCIATION

Dr. Betty Yarborough	1968-69
Mrs. Hilda Pendergrass	1969-70
Mrs. Ruth Lewis	1970-71
Mrs. Mae Franklin	1971-72
Mrs. Mary Johnson	1972-73

1973-74 VIRGINIA STATE READING ASSOCIATION OFFICERS

President	Miss Patricia King Virginia Beach, Virginia
President Elect	Miss June Curry Norfolk, Virginia
Secretary	Mrs. Mary C. Holmes Hampton, Virginia
Treasurer	Mr. John C. Coates, III Lynchburg, Virginia
State Organizational Chairman	Dr. Edmund Henderson Director, McGuffy Reading Clinic University of Virginia Charlottesville, Virginia

1973-74 Virginia State Reading Association
Standing Committees

Publications and Research

Dr. Robert Gibbons, Longwood College
Dr. Betty Yarborough, Old Dominion University

Elections

Mrs. Lillie H. Riddick, Virginia Beach
Mrs. Suzanne L. Elliot, Chester

Budget

Mr. John C. Coates,III, Lynchburg
Mr. Joseph Binford, Richmond

Evaluation

Mrs. Anne J. Henry, Virginia Beach

Resolutions and Legislation

Mrs. Hilda Pendergrass, Goochland County
Mrs. LaVerne Smith, Virginia Union University

Professional Standards and Ethics

Mr. Henry Goff, Brownsburg
Mrs. Lois C. Miller, Chatham

Membership

Miss Sara Haught, Virginia Beach

Newsletter

Mrs. Audrey B. Cooper, Hampton
Mr. Roy E. Brinkley, College of William and Mary

Secondary Interest

Dr. Thomas Estes, University of Virginia

FOREWARD

Encouraging the study of reading instruction at all educational levels throughout all of Virginia . . .

Disseminating knowledge regarding trends, research, and new developments in the teaching of reading . . .

Stimulating and promoting research in developmental, creative, corrective, and remedial reading . . .

These are three of the purposes of the Virginia State Reading Association. It is the hope of the VSRA that this, the second official publication of the association, will help in accomplishing these purposes.

A NOTE FROM THE EDITORS

Many interesting and worthwhile reading projects are undertaken by teachers all over Virginia every year. Unfortunately, many teachers are afraid to write articles for state or national journals concerning their projects. The editors of Reading in Virginia are most interested in publishing YOUR article on any topic related to reading. It can be a research article or it can be an article providing information on a reading project, reading series, reading materials and equipment, successful methods and techniques used in teaching reading, etc.

It is the hope of the Virginia State Reading Association to publish one issue of Reading in Virginia each year. Guidelines for submitting an article include:

1. Maximum of 500 words, preferably less.
2. Please type your article, double-spaced.
3. Please sign your name, title, and address.
4. Please include a title for your article.
5. If necessary, your article may have to be edited to fit the space available. It may not be possible to submit the edited version to you for your approval prior to publication.
6. The deadline for submitting YOUR article for the 1974-75 issue of Reading in Virginia will be January 1, 1975.
7. Write to the editors if you need additional information:

Dr. Robert D. Gibbons, Editor
or
Mr. J. Lee Pemberton, III, Assistant Editor
Department of Education
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia 23901

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LOOK, MOVE, READ 1
Nancy Hudgins
Shirley White

TEACHING READING IN VIRGINIA: SOME OBSERVATIONS. . 4
Robert D. Gibbons

INDIVIDUALIZED SKILLS PROGRAM 7
Jennie J. DeGenaro

EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT: PILOT READING PROGRAM, GRADES K-3. 10
ESEA TITLE I: READING INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY. . . 11
James M. Anderson, Jr.
Verna J. Allen
Pamela Wright
Claude Miller, Jr.

DISABLED READER PROGRAM. 13
Pat King

THE INTELLECTUAL FUNCTIONING OF CORRECTIVE READERS. 15
Roy E. Brinkley
Karin R. Helstrom

A READING FOLK TALE . . . ? 23
Mary Helen Brubeck

READING IMPROVEMENT--IT'S EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS IN THE RICHMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS 25
Virgie M. Binford

RENOVATION = REWARDS 28
Barbara Waddell

GOOCHLAND COUNTY READING NOTES 30
Hilda P. Pendergrass

VIP ARRIVES IN NORFOLK 31
June Curry

I BELIEVE I CAN READ 33
Betty J. Blaisdell
James D. Mullins

READING IN VIRGINIA'S CATHOLIC SCHOOLS 35
Sister Elaine McCarron

EDUCATION HIGHLIGHTS of Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr.'s address to the General Assembly of Virginia on January 14, 1974. 37

OUR EDUCATION: A report on the 1970 census. 38

LOOK, MOVE, READ

Mrs. Nancy Hudgins
Mrs. Shirley White
Team I Reading Teachers
Chesterfield County Public Schools
Chesterfield County, Virginia

Look, Move, Read is a reading and perceptual motor efficiency program designed to correct reading difficulties. This special project was developed and written in 1972 by Mesdames Nancy Hudgins and Shirley White, Team I reading teachers, under the guidance of Mrs. Jean Copeland, elementary school supervisor for Team I and with the approval of Dr. John E. Galloway, assistant superintendent of instructional services. Allan Howell, physical education teacher for Team I conducts the coordination classes for this program.

C.E. Curtis Elementary School was chosen as the site for this project. Instructional time is set for every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. The children involved in Look, Move, Read are divided into two groups, so that each group receives 30 minutes of coordination training and 30 minutes of small group reading instruction. At 10:30 a.m. the students meet for continued reading activities. From 11:00 to 12:00 noon the reading teachers work with these students on an individual basis.

Look, Move, Read has developed into a multi-faceted program. In addition to the primary purpose of increasing a child's reading efficiency, it is a program which can assist the classroom teacher in a variety of ways. It provides a phonetic (auditory) as well as a whole word (visual) approach to reading instruction which supplements any basal text. The classroom teacher can adapt any part of the reading program to the needs of her students. For example, if children are having difficulty in learning vowel digraphs, the teacher can use lessons and activities which will strengthen this skill. The program will serve as a guide for remedial instruction for the teacher who is working with all below-level readers.

For the child who is poorly coordinated, a variety of techniques is offered for perceptual motor training. The team or school physical education teacher can assist the classroom teacher in conducting the activities for perceptual motor coordination. When this assistance is not available, the classroom teacher will be able to conduct the perceptual motor training by following the suggestions outlined in the Look, Move, Read guide.

The coordination training does not have to be limited to the child who is deficient in reading but can help any child who needs to gain proficiency in his motor development. Another aspect of the program is its instructional flexibility which makes it adaptable to the class time scheduling of any school.

The teachers of this program coordinate with many team and staff personnel to meet the various needs of the students. These people include Garland Updyke, principal; Mrs. Lula Allgood, assistant principal; and the language arts teachers of the Curtis faculty. Others are Mrs. Janie Goodman, Team I art teacher; Mrs. Vickie Broughman, Team III physical education teacher; Tom Doland, Team I psychologist; and Mrs. Wanda Duncan, school nurse. Parent-teacher conferences also play an important role in the assessment of student behavior and abilities. Parental cooperation and interest definitely are strengths of the program.

In September of 1972, extensive screening was done to determine which children had deficiencies in both reading and perceptual motor coordination. During the first screening of approximately 350 upper elementary students, approximately 70 showed signs of having some perceptual motor difficulties. A refined second screening eliminated half of these children. The reading achievement of these 35 children was then carefully evaluated by the reading teachers who studied reading test scores from previous years and discussed reading performance with the pupils' language arts teachers.

The next step in the screening process included giving a battery of group tests. These included the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, Chesterfield County Reading Skills Test, and the Winter Haven Test of Perceptual Skills. Individual tests administered later were the Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty and the Slosson Intelligence Test. The reading teachers interpreted the results of these test data in order to determine which children were the most seriously deficient and therefore needed the special training that this program offers.

Since then, each child has made progress in his ability to read since participating in this program. Some children have gained enough reading proficiency to return full time to their regular language arts classes. Success in reading has fostered a tremendous change in student self concept. Positive and confident attitudes have replaced sullen and/or shy behavior. The daily Look, Move, Read lessons were planned to assure each child involved in the program a successful reading experience.

The resources for this program include: Vowel Sounds Learning Module (Singer-S.V.E.), Eye, Ear, Hand Phonics (Educational Activities), Bill Martin Instant Readers (Holt Rinehart and Winston), Reading Incentive Program (Bomar), Mission: Read, Launch (Singer/ Random House), Jim Forest Series (Field Enterprises), Creative Reading Program (Grolier), Books A,B,C,E, and filmstrips (J.B. Lippincott), Developing Learning Readiness (Webster Division McGraw Hill), Phonics We Use, Books B,C,D (Lyons and Carnahan), Spice (Educational Service), Rescue (Educational Service), Daily Sensorimotor Training Activities (Educational Activities), The Remediation of Learning Disabilities (Fearon), Enriching Perception and Cognition (Special Child Publications) and Dynamic Balancing Activities (record for balance beam activities ... Educational Activities), and Read on Criterion Tests in Reading Skills (Random House/Singer).

Bear is like bare, and pear is like pare, but tear is pronounced tier and tare. Then hear is like here, and sear is like sere, and dear, shear like deer and sheer. Beat's not like great, nor beak like break, and neither is freak like steak; while beam, strange to say, will rhyme with seam, as well as with cream and dream.

Feign, deign and reign rhyme with fain, Dane and rain, as well as with skein, rein, vein. Although sew is like so, still new is like gnu, and ewe we pronounce just you.

Though dough rhymes with toe, and rough with ruff; enough, tough, and sough with gruff. But cough rhymes with off, and bough is like bow, while plough is the same word as plow. With bow, too, like beau, we have dough like doe, and glow, grow, and owe like go. But growl is like owl, while grown, mown and own don't rhyme well with brown but with bone.

Kalends, Sunshine Magazine

English is a funny language. A fat chance and a slim chance are the same thing.

TEACHING READING IN VIRGINIA: SOME OBSERVATIONS

Dr. Robert D. Gibbons
Associate Professor of Education
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

As a former public elementary school teacher and principal and now as an associate professor of education, I have had the opportunity to work with many, many public school teachers and administrators throughout the state of Virginia. For example, during the past five years I have had the pleasure, while supervising student teachers, of working with at least 200 teachers.

During my visits, I have observed reading being taught from kindergarten through grade twelve. Teachers have been observed using a wide variety of reading programs, materials, visual aids, and equipment. The use of paraprofessionals (some paid, some volunteers), team teaching, nongradedness, individualized instruction, teaching by behavioral objectives, and flexible scheduling are some of the various innovations being tried by teachers and administrators to teach reading and other subjects to children in Virginia.

Because relatively few pepple are able to work with teachers on all grade levels, I would like to mention a few personal observations about teaching reading to boys and girls:

1. Teachers ARE teaching reading.

2. Children ARE learning to read, regardless of what certain newspaper editorial writers have to say.

3. The standardized test results in reading, as released by the Virginia State Board of Education, indicate that public school children in Virginia ARE making normal or average progress in reading. According to the latest release, the average IQ score of a child in fourth grade is 98 (compared with a national average of 100) and his average grade level score in reading is 4.5 (compared to the national average of 4.7). The results also indicate that there is a greater diversification of scores above the average than there is below the average score, meaning that there are thousands of children in Virginia who score well above grade level when it comes to reading.

4. When compared with other states, one factor

exists which may indicate that children in Virginia are actually doing very well in reading. This factor is kindergarten. (This author attended a public school kindergarten in New Jersey in 1940.) Children who attend kindergarten actually have four years of schooling before entering the fourth grade; those who do not attend have three years of schooling. As can be seen below, thousands upon thousands of children in Virginia never had the opportunity to attend public kindergarten. In reality, therefore, they are one year behind before they even start school!

TABLE I

ENROLLMENT OF PUPILS IN PUBLIC, PRIVATE, AND PAROCHIAL KINDERGARTEN AND FIRST GRADE IN VIRGINIA: 1970-73

Enrollment[1] of pupils in Va. public:	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73
A. Kindergarten	25,326	26,813	27,720
B. First Grade	93,954	86,083	80,468
Enrollment[2] of pupils in Va. private and parochial:			
A. Kindergarten	5,728	5,711	7,024
B. First Grade	3,521	3,148	6,045

[1]Figures supplied by the Virginia State Department of Education. Figures for 1973-74 not available at the time this article was written. It is estimated that 53,000 children are attending public kindergarten in 1973-74.

[2]Not all private and parochial schools report their enrollment to the State Department of Education.

Virginia has many new community colleges costing millions of dollars. New prison and recreational facilities are being built. Ecology is costing the public millions of dollars. Political pressure does get results. Yet in 1973-74, thirty-seven (37) public school divisions in Virginia still do not have kindergarten. Too bad five-year-olds cannot vote! When a four-year-old child was asked when he would start school, the child looked at his fingers and then replied, "When my thumb is up." Unfortunately, this does not apply to thousands of four-year-olds in Virginia.

5. The Virginia General Assembly states that the teacher-pupil ratio for elementary schools is to be 1:30 in average daily membership; for secondary schools, 1:23. Elementary school teachers are expected to have larger classes, less help from other professionals and yet supposedly be just as successful as secondary school teachers in teaching students. The rationale behind this fact has never been adequately explained to this author.

6. The Virginia State Board of Education has never found it necessary to appoint someone to be supervisor of reading for the state (language arts, yes; reading, no.)

7. The Virginia State Board of Education, until October, 1972, stated that to be certified to teach reading, an elementary school teacher needed to take three semester hours in the teaching of reading; now the total is six! But an elementary school teacher also has to take fifteen semester hours in social science, twelve in English, six in math, six in science, six in health and physical education, etc. Presumably there is logic to these certification requirements.

8. Recent newspaper articles indicate that many students do not have textbooks because they cannot afford to rent or purchase the books. Efforts to provide free texts to all students in the public schools in Virginia have repeatedly been defeated by the Virginia General Assembly. Why? Because it costs too much! Yes, it is costly--lower achievement scores, for example.

9. Public criticism of how teachers teach reading is nothing new. According to the 1873 National Education Association Proceedings, "In general, reading has not been successfully taught in our primary schools. Good readers are the exceptions." Similar comments are still being heard today. Since 1873, millions of people have learned to read; unfortunately, many others have not. As Verna D. Anderson states, ". . . the challenge is not to criticize but to find better ways."

POLICY STATEMENT: Reading in Virginia is a publication of the Virginia State Reading Association. The contents do not necessarily imply endorsement by the VSRA or by the editors.

INDIVIDUALIZED SKILLS PROGRAM

Mrs. Jennie J. DeGenaro
Coordinator for the VOLUNTEERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN HENRICO
Henrico County Public Schools
Henrico County, Virginia

For the past three years, Mrs. DeGenaro served as a diagnostician in the Individualized Skills Program.

The Individualized Skills Program commenced in the fall of 1970. This program was designed for students who were diagnosed as having certain learning disabilities. Initially, students were identified by a severe deficiency in reading.

In-service for teachers is incorporated into the program. Classroom, learning disability, and resource teachers and assistant principals become the "rotating staff" during their stay at the Individualized Skills Center. These educators observe and assist in the instruction of the students assigned to the program. Substitutes are provided to classroom teachers who have students in ISP and indicate a desire to visit the Center. Input from teachers concerning students' classroom performance is invaluable in programming.

Inasmuch as the program was federally funded for the first three years, some standardized testing was required. Specific tests were not designated, however. This allows the diagnostician to select the instruments she believes to be of most value. Every student is not necessarily given the same tests. Instruments which have proved to be the most useful are as follows:

The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities
The Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude
The Slingerland Screen Test
The Gilmore Oral Reading Test
Schonell's Grade Word Test
Dolch Basic Sight Word Test
Informal Phonics
Directionality
Gross Motor (informal)
Dominance (informal)

Students in grades one through six are referred by the principals through the Director of Pupil Personnel Services. Students are not assigned to ISP according to grade level, which means that the six students (the maximum number for any one session) may range in grades between one and six.

Selection for ISP is based on the student's demonstrated "gap" between actual achievement and his potential. The school psychologists provide intelligence test scores and the visiting teachers furnish comprehensive background data on each student.

The program goals are as follows:

1. Provide in-service for teachers.
2. Diagnose each student through the use of both formal and informal measures.
3. Establish the method, or modality, by which each student learns most effectively. The philosophy of teaching through the student's strengths while remediating the weaker areas was adopted.
4. Provide information by way of individual prescriptions for each student, delineating:

    a. Tests administered and results obtained.
    b. Strengths and weaknesses identified.
    c. Specific procedures of reinforcement and remediation. These techniques are tried at the center before they are recommended to the classroom teacher.
5. Work with the feeder school throughout the school year as a follow-up process. Students who do not make the expected gains are eligible to return to the ISP Center for further evaluation.

The primary spin-off or "ripple" effect of such a program is as follows:

1. Teachers, not trained in the area of learning disabilities, obtain techniques to use with the assigned student as well as other students who demonstrate similar deficiencies.
2. Parents are encouraged to visit as often as they wish. Methods and techniques for working with their children are provided. Parents gain a better understanding of learning disabilities while observing their child in a school setting.
3. Teachers request materials be purchased by their schools which they observed being used effectively with their students. Teacher-prepared material was also examined and used back in the feeder schools.

Work accomplished at the ISP during the 1972-73 school year included:

1. 126 scheduled conferences with parents and teachers. Teacher conferences often included a staff consisting of the learning diability teachers, principals, psychologists and visiting teachers.
2. Seventy-two visitors observed for one or more days.
3. Forty-three prescriptions were written. Reports were explained in conferences to parents and teachers. Teachers and parents received a copy of the report.

4. Inservice for various faculties to demonstrate techniques and procedures were held on request. These were conducted after school as well as on in-service days.
5. Testing was accomplished on each student at the end of the school year to determine the gains he made in various areas.
6. End-of-the-year reports about the ISP included individual evaluations as well as compilations of the following:

   a. Visitor evaluations of ISP.
   b. Teacher evaluations of students who attended ISP.
   c. Individual student progress reports.

The ISP is located in two different sections of the county. This allows students access to one center or the other, thereby servicing the extreme ends of the county. Each diagnostician is provided with a teacher aide to assist in furthering the individualization of instruction. In addition, the aide performs general clerical duties, types reports, etc.

The ISP is innovative and challenging. It furnishes an opportunity to accomplish diagnostic work, individualize instruction and try out new procedures and techniques. It further provides the opportunity for teachers to observe another teacher working with learning disabled students. There are also many opportunities for research in the various areas of learning disabilities when such a setting is provided.

The three-year federal grant expired at the close of the 1973 school year. The funding for the program was then assumed by the Henrico County School Board. This implies that the services provided continue to meet an existing need, which is to provide additional diagnostic prescriptive services for students with learning disabilities.

The original proposal for this program was written by Dr. Richard L. Boyer, Director of Pupil Personnel Services. The current director is Dr. Morton Bradman, Director of Pupil Personnel Services. Dr. Boyer is currently the Director for Research and Planning.

Mr. James M. Anderson, Jr., Division Superintendent
Mrs. Vera J. Allen, Director of Instruction
Mrs. Pamela Wright, Reading Diagnostic Clinician
Mr. Claude Miller, Jr., Director of Federal Programs
Prince Edward County Public Schools
Farmville, Virginia

(Two reading programs are discussed below: one for pupils in grades K-3 and the other for pupils in grades 4-8.)

EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT: PILOT READING PROGRAM, GRADES K-3

The Title VII Reading Program was designed and implemented because of the large number of children in grades K-3 who demonstrated deficiencies in reading achievement, as evidenced by the spring, 1973, test scores on the Stanford Achievement Test. Regular classroom instruction did not seem to meet their needs and a thorough diagnosis, followed by remedial individualized instruction, seemed to be essential if they were to achieve at their capacity levels.

Prior to September, 1973, all second and third grade children were ranked according to their spring, 1973, test scores. Forty per cent of the students were designated to participate in the Title VII Reading Program: 56 second graders and 65 third graders. Immediately following this classification, a case history form was devised by the clinician and data was compiled about each of the designated students.

Upon entry in school in September, all second and third graders were administered the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test and the Doren Diagnostic Test. Instructional objectives for the ESAA Title VII students were formulated following an analysis of these test results. Students were grouped within the program accordingly.

The remedial instruction implemented by two certified teachers and two aides, emphasizes reading skills through the structured-prescriptive approach of learning centers and instruction of individual needs. A student-teacher ratio of 15-1 is maintained in the four daily class meetings. A fifth session is utilized for those students requiring further instruction.

Activities vary depending on pupil's needs as evidenced by monthly teacher-made tests and are based on each individual's objectives. When deficiencies exist, the teacher, in conjunction with the clinician, attempts to prescribe and provide the necessary learning activities, using the R_x Program, Imperial Primary Reading Program, Language Master Programs, Alpha One, Alpha Time, SRA Reading Labs and games, multisensory materials, and teacher-made centers with supplemental aids.

Concurrent with the instructional activities of the remedial classroom is the diagnostic testing utilized by the clinician in the Reading Center. Those children exhibiting more serious deficiencies are given priority in individualized testing. When findings seem conclusive, a diagnostic and prescriptive narrative is written and becomes a part of the child's reading record and a blueprint for his instruction.

As of January 2, 1974, the same procedures were utilized in setting up a K-1 readiness program. The First Grade Screening Test published by American Guidance Service was used for initial screening and various other standardized and informal tests were used for diagnostic purposes. An aide assists the K-1 teacher in the instruction of 88 pupils during eight 30-35 minute daily class sessions. The student-teacher ratio approximates the current ratios in the second and third grade classrooms.

At this point in time, the objectives set in September seem to be realistic. The children are highly motivated and self-esteem and respect for their own unique abilities have been fostered and strengthened through the individualized instruction, care, and love they have received.

The entire staff has high hopes for the results of this year's efforts on the part of all participants: pupils, teachers, parents, and administrators. We have already seen highly interesting and motivating instruction, and much progress on the part of the ESAA Title VII students.

ESEA TITLE I: READING INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY

The Reading Instructional Activity for the ESEA Title I Program in Prince Edward County is designed to meet documented learner needs. Even though the target schools do not have students whose needs are identical, our overall program in remedial reading is intended to meet the specific needs of the individual learner in fourth through eighth grades. Among the needs which were documented are deficiencies in grammar, spelling, comprehension, vocabulary, word meaning, sentence meaning, and paragraph comprehension. These areas were determined by administering the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test and teacher-made tests.

The rationale for our reading program geared to the needs of 375 students focuses on individualized instruction. We use three reading centers in our elementary schools and one classroom in the high school.

In our remedial reading program, the teacher-pupil ratio is maintained at the level of one teacher and one aide for each fifteen students. During the school day, each teacher, with an aide, works with seventy-five students. Each class meets for about forty-five minutes daily.

Both individualized and small group instruction are implemented, using selected materials based on learner needs, that would relatedto stories, sounds, rhyming words, tapes, records, flash cards, tach-x and control readers (filmstrips). Other materials that are used include SRA Reading labs, Reading Development Kits, main idea books, reading text books, workbooks to follow directions and to locate answers, and dictionaries. These materials are quite necessary in providing learning experiences in auditory discrimination, visual discrimination, vocabulary, reading comprehension, study skills, word attack skills and paragraph comprehension.

We consider continuous evaluation as a very essential part of our program. By keeping careful and accurate records of an individual's progress, it is our belief that the teacher can focus on difficulties and can make advance preparation. Because all students do not learn at the same rate, we believe that our remedial reading program has been very beneficial in closing the gap for reading improvement.

Students participating in our program scored from the 49th downward to the 8th percentile as evidenced by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. As part of our evaluative design, we employ pre- and post-testing in order to determine progression or digression as to progress on the part of the student.

We find that the majority of our remedial reading students are being helped and we continue to be most optimistic about our Title I remedial reading program.

Read no history: nothing but biography, for that is life without theory.

Disraeli

DISABLED READER PROGRAM

Miss Pat King
Supervisor of Reading Programs
Virginia Beach Public Schools
Virginia Beach, Virginia

The Virginia Beach City Public School Division has a special reading program designed to give pupils who have normal ability to learn but who have severe reading problems more help than they can receive in a regular school setting. Started in 1968, the program currently has 105 youngsters, ages seven to seventeen, grouped chronologically into seven homerooms.

In these homerooms the pupils receive instruction in social studies, science, mathematics, and language arts. Pressure to work in grade level texts in various subject areas is removed. Small groupings within the classroom enable each child to receive instruction on his own level in math and language skill areas; other academic subjects are taught in interest units through audiovisual materials. Special teachers provide instruction in art, music, physical education, and shop.

Groups of four or five pupils on the same reading level, with similar reading problems, are scheduled for the reading clinic daily for forty- to fifty-minute periods. Each youngster's reading program is individualized to meet his needs. Each moves at his own rate. The reading clinicians work closely with the classroom teachers to insure that skills taught in the clinic are reinforced in the classrooms.

Pupils attending this special reading program have average or above average ability to learn but they are three or more years behind their reading capacities. Many of the younger children experience great difficulty learning letters and some of these children become very confused in paper and pencil tasks. Some of the children have been diagnosed as having minimal cerebral dysfunction or neurological impairment. Some are also emotionally handicapped, usually as an effect of academic problems but rarely as a primary cause. The teachers and resource persons provide special help in remediating these needs.

Each public school in Virginia Beach has a reading resource teacher who screens children having difficulty learning to read. Youngsters with severe reading problems are referred for more in-depth evaluation by the school division's reading diagnosticians. Pupils meeting the criteria for entrance into the program are offered a place in the program when space is available.

The eligible student may stay in the program from one to three years. Length of stay depends upon the speed with which the youngster responds to therapy. The goal of the program is to help each youngster reach his reading capacity or at least be functional on his grade level.

Varied programs and techniques are used with these children to present or reinforce basic reading skills. Machines are very much a part of the program. Experience has shown that some of these youngsters are more easily motivated by machines than by the teacher and the book. Work time on the machines is used as a reward as well as for instruction purposes. Machines provide endless individualized reinforcement of reading skills and auditory training, freeing the reading clinician to instruct other students.

The choice of the program and its technique of presentation and materials, whether of a machine nature or of the more traditional pupil-teacher arrangement, are determined for each youngster on the basis of that child's response. The goal remains to help each pupil become functionally independent and return to a regular classroom as soon as possible.

This program is funded entirely with local monies. In Virginia Beach we believe the right to read is the privilege of all our children. The program for Disabled Readers provides a giant step for the youngsters with severe reading disabilities.

Eighty-five (85) percent of the words in the English language have a regular spelling.

Unfortunately, the fifteen (15) percent with irregular spelling are used eighty-five (85) per cent of the time. If a child is exposed to the confusing fifteen (15) percent when he is first learning to read, he can be as overwhelmed as is a foreigner trying to read our language.

Ruth Jackson
New York Public Schools

THE INTELLECTUAL FUNCTIONING OF CORRECTIVE READERS

Roy E. Brinkley, Director
The Reading Center

Karin R. Helstrom, Reading Specialist
The Reading Center
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The literature in the field of reading tends to indicate that readers should utilize caution when reading research in which the sample population came from clinically tested children only. Such statements originate with clinicians themselves frequently, and, for many research studies published, these remarks should be heeded. However, there also appears to be very little attention given to those characteristics on which clinically tested children do differ from the typical classroom child. This study, then, will initiate a series of investigations by which an attempt will be made to answer the question with respect to children in the Tidewater area of Virginia. More specifically, the concern here shall be with only one aspect--current intellectual functioning as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) and the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests: New Edition, Alpha Test, short form and Beta Test (OTIS).

Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that the group of corrective readers referred to the College of William and Mary Reading Center between February, 1972 and June, 1973 would be representative of the norms of the WISC and the OTIS.

Assumptions

The test norms would be assumed to be representative of these children if their scores approximated a normal distribution and their means did not differ significantly ($p < .05$) from the means established by the test publishers. A distribution was considered near normal if the mean and median were almost equal, relative to the standard deviation, and the range of scores was close to two standard deviations in both directions from the mean.

The WISC is generally regarded as a highly reliable test of present intellectual functioning, so it was considered a suitable criterion against which to validate the OTIS as a measure of present intellectual functioning.

Related Literature

Other studies have made similar investigations concerning the validity of these tests for corrective readers. Sandstedt (1964) tested forty-five corrective readers referred to the University of Delaware's Reading Study Center. She found no significant differences between the means of their scores on the WISC Scales and those stated by the publisher. Jerrolds, Callaway, and Gwaltney (1971) reported WISC means for those children referred to the Reading Clinic at the University of Georgia, and their results also indicated that the WISC norms were appropriate for these children.

Deal (1965) reviewed the research concerning patterns of WISC subtest scores of retarded readers. She concluded that there was no standardization of research models, which made comparisons difficult. Results varied widely, but the most consistent findings were low mean scaled scores on Information, Arithmetic, and Coding subtests and high mean scores on Comprehension and Picture Completion subtests.

Siebert (1963) examined the scores of 423 juvenile delinquents who had been administered the WISC and OTIS tests. The means for these tests were all found to be in the 80's, but he found no significant differences between the means of the WISC and each OTIS test. He also noted that Picture Completion was one of the two highest subtests for the group administered the OTIS, form Alpha, and concluded that this test might be measuring an isolated skill.

PROCEDURE

Students referred to the Reading Center were routinely administered the WISC. Many were also administered the OTIS test appropriate to their school grade. The records of these students became the data source for this study. Scores were available for 114 children referred between February, 1972 and June, 1973. Their ages ranged from six years seven months to fifteen years one month, with a mean age of ten years six months and a median age of nineteen years eleven months.

The mean, median, range, and unbiased standard deviation were calculated for each test and subtest. The means were compared to those of the normative populations by use of a t-test for single samples. The hypothesized true means were the means established by the test publishers. Re-

sults of the t-test were used to determine if there were significant differences between the observed and expected means, the confidence levels (p) involved, and the magnitude of experimental effect (r_m).

Correlations were found between pairs of tests, with each pair of scores coming from a single subject. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine the degree of relationship between the scores. It was then tested to learn if this relationship was significant, at a given confidence level, or if it should be attributed to chance.

RESULTS

Means of Test Scores

The mean scores for the population under investigation are shown in Table 1. Those for the WISC and OTIS tests were very close to the hypothesized means of 100, with no significant differences between them. The scores for these tests were slightly skewed, but the sample had a near normal distribution. The standard deviations were slightly lower than those of the normative populations; however, none of the calculated statistics were significantly different from the publishers' statistics.

Means of WISC Subtests

Most of the WISC subtests had means close to the mean of 10 established by the test publisher, as shown in Table 2. Each unbiased standard deviation rounded to 3, which was also as expected.

Three subtests in the Verbal Scale did have means significantly different from 10. The mean of the Similarities subtest was higher than expected, and the mean of the Digit Span subtest was lower than was expected. Both differences were highly significant but of only moderate magnitude. Less significant and of very low magnitude was the difference for the Vocabulary subtest, with the observed mean slightly higher than was expected.

The Object Assembly subtest was the only Performance measure with a mean significantly different from 10. This difference was of low magnitude and low significance.

Correlations Between OTIS and WISC IQ's

Table 3 shows that the highest correlation between the OTIS, Alpha test and the WISC was for the WISC Full Scale. This correlation was moderately high. The

TABLE 1

Central Tendencies and Dispersions of Test Scores

	IQ						Age (yr. - mo.)		
Test	Mean	Median	S.D.	Range	N	r_m>	Mean	Median	Range
WISC									
Full Scale	101.2	101	12.7	54-124	97		10-6	10-11	6-7 - 15-1
Verbal Scale	101.1	103	13.8	47-134	113				
Performance Scale	102.1	103	13.5	61-136	98				
OTIS									
Alpha	99.6	97	11.8	79-126	44		9-0	9-2	6-7 - 9-9
Beta	100.7	104	13.8	77-125	27		11-10	11-7	10-2 - 13-8

TABLE 2

Central Tendencies and Dispersions of WISC Subtests

Subtest	Mean	Median	S.D.	Range	N	r_m>
Verbal						
Information	9.7	10	2.9	2-19	110	
Comprehension	10.0	10	3.3	2-19	110	
Arithmetic	9.8	10	2.7	1-16	110	
Similarities	11.7***	12	3.0	2-18	110	.31
Vocabulary	10.7*	11	3.3	1-20	110	.16
Digit Span	8.9***	9	2.9	2-18	97	.33
Performance						
Picture Completion	10.2	11	3.4	4-20	95	
Picture Arrangement	10.3	11	2.7	4-18	95	
Block Design	10.5	11	3.0	4-17	95	
Object Assembly	10.6*	11	2.7	4-19	95	.21
Coding 10.0	10.0	10	3.3	1-20	95	

r_m = magnitude of experimental effect *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001

correlations with the Verbal and Performance Scales were lower, but still significant.

Of the Verbal subtests, Information correlated most highly with the OTIS Alpha test. Comprehension and Similarities correlated the lowest. Most significant of the correlations with Performance subtests was for Block Design. Coding correlated extremely little.

The correlations between the OTIS Beta and the WISC IQ's varied widely, from r=.72 with the Verbal Scale to r=.32 with the Performance Scale. The highest correlations with the Verbal subtests were for Vocabulary, Information, and Arithmetic. The lowest was for Comprehension. Correlations with the Performance subtests varied from r=.45 for Picture Arrangement to r=-.18 for Picture Completion.

TABLE 3

Correlations Between OTIS and WISC IQ's

WISC Scale	OTIS IQ			
	Alpha		Beta	
	r	N	r	N
Full	.59***	37	.60**	20
Verbal	.43**	44	.72***	27
Information	.43**	43	.57**	27
Comprehension	.18	43	.29	27
Arithmetic	.36*	43	.56**	27
Similarities	.19	43	.52**	27
Vocabulary	.36*	43	.60***	27
Digit Span	.24	38	.46*	24
Performance	.48**	37	.32	20
Picture Completion	.34*	36	-.18	20
Picture Arrangement	.26	36	.45*	20
Block Design	.63***	36	.43	20
Object Assembly	.37*	36	.12	20
Coding	.08	36	.38	20

r = Pearson correlation coefficient
*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .001

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

WISC

The means of the WISC scaled scores were so close to those of their normative population, and their dispersion wide, that their norms were considered representative of the population at large. Any limitations in range could be explained by the limited size of the sample. Therefore, the norms could be considered valid for these children, which agrees with the findings of Sandstedt. More important, the results indicate that these corrective readers were no more or less intelligent than the general population represented by the test norms. The results also make possible the use of the WISC as a criterion against which to measure the validity of other tests as measures of current intellectual functioning.

Analysis of the subtests showed that this group of children scored lower on the Digit Span subtest than the normative population. On the one hand, this might be taken to mean that these children possess deficiencies in attention and concentration, factors necessary for learning to read. However, on the other hand, their scores on the Arithmetic subtest, which also requires attention and concentration, were within the expected. It would appear then that the nature of the task--meaningless (Digit Span) vs. meaningful (Arithmetic)--might account for the differences noted. These children also scored higher than the normative sample on the Similarities, Vocabulary, and Object Assembly subtests. These results tend to indicate that these children possess better than average abilities to analyze verbal relationships, to produce adequate definitions for selected words, and to perceive the relationships of parts to a whole. While these results do not correspond to those reported by Deal, neither do they contradict them; rather, they confirm her opinion that there is wide variation among studies.

OTIS

The results indicate that the OTIS test norms could also be considered representative of this group of corrective readers. For the children to whom the OTIS was administered, the high correlation with the WISC Full Scale tends to indicate that the tests were measuring much the same factors, and therefore the OTIS could be considered a valid test of present intellectual functioning. This conclusion agrees with the findings of Siebert, even though the Picture Completion scores were not as high as he reported.

The high correlation of the Alpha form with the Block Design subtest may indicate that they were both measuring an aspect of visual perception. The high correlation of the Beta form with the Verbal subtests tends to suggest that it was measuring primarily general knowledge and language facility.

SUMMARY

The close agreement between the published norms for the WISC and the OTIS on the one hand with the scores of children referred to the Reading Center at the College of William and Mary suggests that these children do not differ from the general population of school children with respect to current intellectual functioning. Significant differences were found on several of the WISC subtests. However, as these conclusions were based on a relatively small sample size, continued collection of data, followed by a reevaluation of the means and correlations, should increase the reliability of these conclusions. Also, additional studies should focus on word perception, comprehension, and flexibility of reading rates.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Test Analysis

1. "Better Than Chance." Test Service Bulletin, The Psychological Corporation, 45 (May, 1953), pp. 8-12.

2. Deal, Margaret. "A Summary of Research Concerning Patterns of WISC Sub-test Scores of Retarded Readers." Journal of the Reading Specialist, 24 (May, 1965), pp. 101-111.

3. Friedman, Herbert. Introduction to Statistics. New York: Random House, 1972.

4. Galfo, Armand J. and Earl Miller. Interpreting Educational Research. Dubuque, Ill.: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1970.

5. Harris, Albert J., ed. Casebook on Reading Disability. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970.

6. Jerrolds, Bob W., Byron Callaway, and Wayne Gwaltney. "A Comparative Study of Three Tests of Intellectual Potential, Three Tests of Reading Achievement, and the Discrepancy Scores Between Potential and Achievement." The Journal of Educational Research, 65 (Dec., 1971), pp. 168-172.

7. Kaluger, George, and Clifford J. Kolson. Reading and Learning Disabilities. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

8. Kuhlmann-Anderson Test, Seventh Edition, Booklets K, A, B, CD, Technical Manual. Princeton: Personnel Press, Inc., 1963.

9. Lorge, Irving, Robert L. Thorndike, and Elizabeth Hagen. Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests, Technical Manual, multi-level edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

10. Otis, Arthur S. Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests: New Edition, Manual of Directions, Alpha, Beta. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1954.

11. Reid, William R. and Lowell A. Schoer. "Reading Achievement, Social-Class and Subtest Pattern on the WISC." Journal of Educational Research, 59 (August, 1966), pp. 469-472.

12. Sandstedt, Barbara. "Relationship Between Memory Span and Intelligence of Severely Retarded Readers." The Reading Teacher, 17 (Jan., 1964), pp. 246-250.

13. Siebert, Lawrence A. "Matched Otis and Wechsler IQ Scores of Delinquents." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 19 (April, 1963), pp. 215-216.

14. Siebert, Lawrence A. "Otis I.Q. Scores of Delinquents." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 18 (Oct., 1962), p. 517.

15. Strang, Ruth. Reading Diagnosis and Remediation. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1968.

16. Thorndike, Robert L. and Elizabeth Hagan. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969.

Computer Programming

Healy, Jeremiah J. and Dalward J. DeBruzzi. Basic Fortran IV Programming, Self-Instructional Manual and Text. Reading, Mass: Adison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1968.

International Business Machines Corp. IBM System/360 Basic Fortran IV Language. N.Y.: IBM, 1969.

Kennedy, Michael, and Martin B. Solomon. Ten Statement Fortran Plus Fortran IV, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Random House, 1972.

A READING FOLK TALE . . . ?

Mrs. Mary Helen Brubeck
Supervisor of Reading
Roanoke County Public Schools
Salem, Virginia 24153

There is just NO reading program, NO new approach, NO new technique available that you have not already tried, read about, or seen. This article is really just a rehash of everything you already know. However, this rehash in the Roanoke County Schools is organized in a manner that makes reading instruction relevant for teachers and youngsters.

In individual schools, special reading teachers and/or reading specialists are responsible for coordinating the reading program in twenty-six elementary schools, five intermediate or junior highs, five senior highs, and one special education school. The chief purpose is to teach reading to pupils through a developmental understanding and through carefully sequenced materials. Therefore, Roanoke County is striving for a developmental PREVENTIVE reading program from kindergarten through grade twelve.

Excitement mounts when one views a group of eager nonbored pupils moving swiftly from a classroom basal approach into a reading technological center which is an extension of the classroom instruction. Having the pupils involved daily in two different approaches, where approximately an hour and a half is spent on reading, seems to be no great problem for one school where 709 pupils receive systematic instruction EACH day. This revelation has assured Roanoke County educators that they must be on the right track by helping children live in a learning-laboratory atmosphere where they can become independent and solve their problems daily. Folk Tale . . . ? NO! Not from my viewpoint; it is more a Non-fiction Tale.

The basal approach and the reading center approach is practiced in all elementary schools with varying degrees of success, due mainly to the physical plant of the school. For example, one school has no available space for a reading center except in the front entrance corridor. Heaven will smile on this teacher who has made the impossible possible.

The reading laboratory approach is in operation in all secondary schools. Programs are organized for the underachiever and also for the capable reader who would like to continue his improvement. Materials used in the program are developmental and sequentially prepared and

also involve a multi-media approach utilizing many forms of media. Dozens of success stories are available to anyone who is willing to believe.

There actually is no end to this Roanoke County Non-fiction Reading Tale, but space does not permit a detailed presentation. A curriculum guide for the program is available at publication and mailing cost ($4.25) to anyone interested in further information.

Oh for a book and a shady nook,
Either in door or out;
With the green leaves whispering overhead
Or the street cries all about

Where I may read all at my ease,
Both of the new and old;
For a jolly good book whereon to look,
Is better to me than gold.

John Wilson

To read without reflecting is like eating without digesting.

Burke

Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider.

Samuel Johnson

Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested; that is, some books need to be read only in parts; others to be read but not curiously; and some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention. Some books also may be read by deputy, and extracts made of them by others.

Francis Bacon

READING IMPROVEMENT--IT'S EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS IN THE RICHMOND PUBLIC SCHOOLS!

Mrs. Virgie M. Binford
Director of Follow Through
Richmond Public Schools
Richmond, Virginia

In stating one of his primary objectives for the 1973-74 school year, Dr. Thomas C. Little, Superintendent of Richmond Public Schools, declared, "that every employee in this system, including my own immediate staff, will be evaluated next year on the basis of how well he contributes to improving the reading skills of our children." This statement was made in the January, 1973 issue of The School Bell, Vol. III, #5.

The finality of this decision was followed with steps for the implementation of the reading program, as outlined by Dr. Little:

1. All elementary school teachers, all middle school teachers and all high school teachers of English, who have not satisfactorily completed a recent course in the teaching of reading or an approved in-service training program in the teaching of reading, will do so before the end of the 1973-74 school year. Those who do not do so will not be eligible for any salary increment or increase which might be offered.

   Adequate opportunity for these teachers to enroll free of charge in either in-service training or college level classes will be provided. The in-service training programs in the teaching of reading will receive the first priority for funds from our new staff development program.

2. Effective immediately, I have instructed our personnel department that they are not to employ any elementary school teacher, any middle school teacher or any high school teacher of English who has not completed or will not complete a course in the teaching of reading by the end of the first semester of the 1973-74 school year. This is a pre-employment requirement which new employees shall complete at their own expense.

3. The teaching of reading in the Richmond Public Schools will be conducted within the following framework:

   (a) Developmental reading will be taught in kindergarten through grade five. Each principal will make appropriate groupings and vary the time allotted in the teaching of reading to each child according to the progress, or lack of it, which each child is showing.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(b) At the end of grade five, any child who is reading two or more years behind grade level will be retained in a holding class for one year. This class will be completely oriented around diagnostic and remedial reading.

(c) In grades six through eight, any child found to be reading two or more years behind grade level will have his schedule so adjusted that one-fourth to one-third of his school day is spent correcting this deficiency.

(d) At the senior high school level any student scoring in the 25th percentile or below shall schedule a special reading course as a part of his curriculum in addition to the regular requirements for graduation. This special reading course shall be continued throughout the pupil's high school career or until the deficiency is corrected even if an additional year is required for the student to graduate.

Mentioning the Lippincott program as a basic series the system adopted with its "wealth of materials" and provisions for inservice training to those who need it, Dr. Little made it perfectly clear he is not proposing how one must teach. He is interested in every child learning how to read. His commitment, combined with that of the school board and the staff, resulted in a structure with added strengths in the following areas:

Adequate preparation of staff

Preservice and inservice training, along with a variety of reading courses are made available for professionals.

Workshops are conducted for paraprofessionals and parents.

Assessment of each child's needs and developing criteria in reading based upon student achievement and performance goals

Reading needs of children are diagnosed with a reading program prescribed based on areas of strengths and weaknesses.

Availability of a wide variety of reading materials

With the teaching of reading receiving priority, more funds were allocated for teaching materials. This enabled teachers to individualize instruction whenever there is a need.

Curriculum specialists serving as educational catalysts

Each school has the services of a curriculum specialist to creatively improve instruction. This component assisted teachers in planning, implementing and evaluating individual reading programs.

Summarizing the reading program in the Richmond Public Schools, one can conclude that its progress has resulted from a team effort of administrators, supervisors, teachers, paraprofessionals, parents and other interested citizens working for one common goal of giving every child a fair chance to improve his reading skills.

This may sound dated, but I'm convinced that if more fathers read to their young today there'd be fewer fathers talking to themselves on the way out of the visiting room at the Juvenile Hall.

Jake Ehrlich, Trial Lawyer,
in his book A Life In My Hands

There is no such thing as an interesting book. There can only be interested readers.

A.B. Herr

Education . . . has produced a vast population able to read but unable to distinguish what is worth reading.

George M. Trevelyan

It is said that nine words do nearly a fourth of the work in the English language. The words are: and, be, have, it, of, the, will, I and you.

RENOVATION = REWARDS

Barbara Waddell, Principal
Pamplin Elementary School
Appomattox County Public Schools
Pamplin, Virginia

Renovating a 1930 vintage school facility is easy. Renovating an instructional program is a more difficult task. Both have been done at Pamplin Elementary School in Appomattox County since August, 1971. The renovation of the building was done in a brief period of time but a more gradual change has occurred in the instructional program which is still changing toward a continuous progress program for pupils.

Changing the physical facility divided the school into three instructional areas: a primary block for six, seven, and eight year olds; an area where fourth and fifth year students work together; and an area for sixth and seventh year students. The school was fully carpeted and furnished with more flexible type desks and chairs, setting the scene for an environment that provided a new way of learning for the 198 elementary school children in this rural community.

The success of the project is contributed to faculty members who were willing to try new approaches to instruction and who accepted a philosophy of education that recognizes each child as a person with different needs who responds to instruction in different ways.

With this foundation as a basis for change, an in-depth study of the language arts program was initiated. The county-adopted reading series allowed a nongraded approach to teaching reading. Each teacher was responsible for three reading groups; therefore, it was not only possible but very easy to place a student in a group where he could function according to his ability and level of achievement. Teachers began to view themselves as being responsible for the education of a number of students rather than as teachers of a specific grade level. Vertical grouping caused no problem for children as they easily accepted the changes in the building as well as in the instructional program.

Additional Title I paraprofessionals were added to the staff and as teachers and paraprofessionals learned to work together they wanted their work to be meaningful in a way that spelled "progress". An outgrowth of their effort was a centrally established reading file for the use of all teachers. This file contains a folder for each story on every reading level and material to be used for that particular story. The teacher does not use every activity for every group, but the material is readily available and it

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is the teacher who selects the appropriate activities. A similar file containing supplementary skills material for primary teachers has also been established. Teachers feel that the results of these efforts are invaluable in improving reading instruction as well as saving time for busy schedules.

The principal and teachers work closely together to evaluate student progress and to make changes as a result of identified needs. At the end of the school session a final evaluation is made to determine the achievement levels of pupils in reading, spelling and mathematics. This information is used in organizing groups, purchasing materials and establishing the instructional level to begin instruction for each pupil in the fall.

The reward comes in looking back over the past three years and assessing the growth of staff members and the program. Many good things keep happening in our school which includes the addition of a kindergarten, a full-time librarian and ESEA Title II funds to expand our media collection. The addition of a resource teacher in the areas of reading and mathematics is anticipated as the next step in providing additional experiences for our pupils. Teachers who have been with the program since its initiation realize that they are planning more and working harder, but they are quick to acknowledge that their reward comes from their students who, like staff members, are making continuous progress.

He that loves reading
has everything within
his reach.

He has but to desire
and he may possess
himself of every species
of wisdom to judge and
power to perform.

William Godwin

A man ought to read just as inclination leads him, for what he reads as a task will do him little good.

Samuel Johnson

GOOCHLAND COUNTY READING NOTES

Mrs. Hilda P. Pendergrass
Elementary School Supervisor
Goochland County Public Schools
Goochland, Virginia 23063

Goochland County reading resource teachers recently completed a revision of their original Performance Objectives in Reading. In addition to new materials keyed in to the objectives, a series of criterion referenced postests have been developed. The pretests included in the original work have been revised. An appendix has been added to provide a sample copy of the pupil contract for individual study, the check sheet of the objectives, and the individual pupil profile.

Parent Book of the Week Club

As a part of our parent involvement program this year, the Parent Book of the Week Club has been formed. Parents of primary school pupils become members of the club by agreeing in writing to read at least one book a week to their child. Parents of middle and upper elementary school students become members by agreeing to either read a book to their child, or each read separately and then discuss the book. The Parent Book of the Week Club is in operation in each elementary school in Goochland County.

Individualizing in Content Areas

A major objective of our reading resource teachers this year is to provide assistance to classroom teachers in individualizing their instruction in the content areas of social studies and science. We have been successful in achieving this through the use of learning packets and folders. Instructional aides were trained in a summer workshop to prepare these materials under the supervision of the reading resource teachers. A classroom teacher explains to the resource teacher what she needs for a particular child or group of children. The resource teacher assists the aide in locating information at varied difficulty levels on the topic requested. The aide then packages the materials into suitable format for individualized study. We are particularly pleased with the success of this because, in past years, we have not always had the carry-over into the classroom of having pupils consistently working at their instructional level. A great deal of effort was expended in the reading room to put the child in success situations but much of what was accomplished in the reading room was lost when the child went into content area classes where, for him, instruction was always at frustration levels. Because of the success of this activity, we plan to expand this to include all grade levels.

VIP ARRIVES IN NORFOLK

June Curry
Coordinator of Reading Instruction
Norfolk Public Schools
Norfolk, Virginia

Norfolk Public Schools now has a VIP--Virginia Inner-City Project, that is. It all started late in the spring of 1973 when the state legislature appropriated a half-million dollars for pilot projects in Richmond and Norfolk. These cities were challenged to develop model programs for improving reading and mathematics achievement among inner-city students above the fourth grade.

The reading component of VIP, budgeted at approximately $89,000, relies heavily on the expertise of the Center for Expansion of Language and Thinking (CELT), a non-profit organization formed to disseminate information gleaned from recent research on the nature of the reading process and to provide consultant services to local school systems throughout the country. CELT members have all participated in Reading Miscue Research at Wayne State University under the direction of Dr. Kenneth S. Goodman.

Six elementary schools--Bay View, Monroe, Roberts Park, Tarrallton, Tidewater Park and West--and six junior high schools--Campostella, Jacox, Lake Taylor, Norview, Rosemont, and Willard--are participating in the reading component of VIP. CELT consultants conducted a pre-session workshop for participating fifth, sixth, and seventh grade teachers from these schools on August 28 and 29, 1973. In addition, two or more consultants have conducted workshops and/or visited VIP classrooms in October and November of 1973 and January, February, and April of 1974.

Reading Miscue Research has revealed some startling insights into the nature of the reading process. Rather than accumulating bits of information in an additive fashion, the reader, at whatever proficiency level, was found to process simultaneously three kinds of information--graphophonic, or sound-symbol; syntactic, or grammatical; and semantic, or meaning. The most efficient reader, it was discovered, is not the one who uses every available bit of information; rather, he is the one who samples judiciously only that information essential to obtaining meaning from the selection.

The research tool which generated these and other useful discoveries about the reading process was later simplified to become the Reading Miscue Inventory (Goodman, Yetta, and Carolyn Burke, Macmillan, 1972), a diagnostic

procedure which permits analysis of a reader's use of reading strategies while he is actively engaged in the reading process. Administration of the Miscue Inventory provides valuable insights into the nature of the reading process and permits an assessment of readability factors in reading materials.

Reading problems are legion among inner-city students, yet no one has offered a legitimate reason for such difficulties. Remedial measures have almost uniformly consisted of heavy doses of phonics instruction. Miscue research has demonstrated that inner-city youngsters utilize graphophonic cues (phonics) to a far greater degree than most teachers and parents would expect. Rather it is the use of syntactic cues (Does it sound like language?) and semantic cues (Does it make sense?) that usually need greater emphasis through provision of appropriate strategy lessons.

Teachers in the VIP project have received instruction in the administration of the Reading Miscue Inventory and the development of reading strategy lessons. They have been encouraged to administer the inventory to several of their students.

CELT consultants have recommended a flexible room arrangement with many learning opportunities, a wide variety and range of interesting reading materials, especially paperbacks, reading to students regularly, and a daily time for students to engage in uninterrupted reading of materials of their choice. The program is centered on language experiences, but in a broader context than that which is usually identified with language experience. In addition, it relies heavily on what Yetta Goodman calls teachers' "professional sense."

Already, changes have been observed in the enthusiasm demonstrated by formerly reluctant readers and formerly discouraged teachers. Many reading teachers not included in the project attended the August workshop, and, as a result, there has been considerable "spin-off" in our regular reading programs.

I wish thee as much pleasure in the reading,
as I had in the writing.

Francis Quarles
(Dedicated to the reader in
his book Emblems)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I BELIEVE I CAN READ

ESAA Special Reading Project
Timber Lane Elementary School
Fairfax County Public Schools
Fairfax County, Virginia

Betty J. Blaisdell
English Specialist
Administrative Area III

James D. Mullins
Curriculum Specialist for Reading
Fairfax County Public Schools
Fairfax County, Virginia

In August of 1973, the staff at Timber Lane Elementary School began a special reading project granted under the Emergency School Aid Act and funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The purpose of the project is to increase the level of proficiency in reading, to train and utilize parents in instructing reading skills at home and at school, and to organize and implement inservice training programs for teachers in techniques for teaching reading and language development skills.

Contending that the self-concept of the student is directly related to his learning potential and success in reading, the staff has been providing a variety of success experiences in language arts and reading and a multi-cultural approach to learning. These experiences are specifically designed to enrich and enhance the development of the positive self-image of each student. Teachers encourage students to explore, discover, and accept their own ideas as well as those of others. Thus, the role of the teacher becomes that of a facilitator of learning rather than a dispenser of information.

One of the most important aspects of the program is parent participation. Support and involvement of parents is a key to the success of each child's development in reading. Not only are parents trained to help the child with reading skills at home, but also they are trained to assist in the classroom.

A language arts resource team consisting of two reading specialists and two language arts specialists coordinate activities, materials, and inservice programs for teachers and parents; and provide leadership in diagnosis, prescription, and evaluation of learners. Seven instructional aides facilitate small group instruction and assist the teachers in providing the necessary programs to meet the varied learning styles and assessed needs of students.

A reading laboratory has been developed to provide developmental, remedial, and enrichment reading experiences for all students in the school. The laboratory activities are designed to complement and reinforce the students' reading program rather than replace the classroom program. Learning centers and materials are designed, tested, and refined in the reading laboratory; then they are checked-out by children who continue to use them in their classroom.

Teachers are learning to integrate affective as well as cognitive skills in reading as they plan strategies for effecting student involvement into the total program. Additional training sessions are being provided by consultants in human relations for the purpose of creating a greater sensitivity and awareness among teachers and parents to children's interests and needs.

At Timber Lane School, parents, teachers, and students are working together to insure that students not only believe they can read but actually do read.

The U.S. Office of Education estimates that 7 million elementary and secondary school children have severe reading problems.

The United States has approximately 19 million adults who are considered to be functionally illiterate. They cannot read the help-wanted ads, complete forms for a driver's license or Social Security, etc.

According to the National Education Association, one of four students nationwide has significant reading deficiencies. About one-half of the unemployed youth, ages 16-21, are functionally illiterate. Three-quarters of the juvenile offenders in New York City are two or more years retarded in reading.

Recent studies indicate that the number of boys who either read poorly or not at all exceeds the number of girls by 10 to 1!!!

READING IN VIRGINIA'S CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Sister Elaine McCarron, S.C.N.
Director of Elementary Education
Department of Schools, Diocese of Richmond
817 Cathedral Place
Richmond, Virginia

Planning a reading program for 57 elementary schools in rural, urban and suburban Virginia is perhaps an impossible task.

Reading is viewed as an integral part of a total language arts program. Its purpose is to provide for systematic and sequential development of reading competencies and interests for all students.

In view of this, our schools are given ten ingredients to include in their program. Around these essentials each school develops its own creative program.

1. Planning: Principal, faculty and students design a program, keeping in mind the needs of their students.

2. Grouping: Ability grouping ungraded or within a single grade; placement based on:

   A. Teacher evaluation
   B. Standardized tests
   C. Reading Progress Cards

   Comprehension questions are more valid and interest higher when each group has its own basic text.

3. Skill Development: Consistent instruction in:

   A. varied word attack methods
   B. comprehension skills
   C. skills for reading in content areas
   D. critical reading skills

4. Materials: Up-to-date and varied materials which include:

   A. basic readers
   B. literary readers
   C. newspapers and magazines
   D. reading labs

5. Libraries: A school library with materials covering a wide ability range, open during the entire school day to all classes; classroom libraries, easily accessible, covering a wide ability range, well stocked with paperbacks and other reading materials.

6. Independent Reading: An enrichment program which encourages a wide selection of books for student satisfaction and enjoyment:

   A. student selects book of his own choosing
   B. time provided in school for independent reading
   C. sharing time provided.

7. Relation to Total Curriculum: Listening, speaking, writing are vital to the reading process and, therefore, continuously interrelated. Teachers should be cognizant of the reading skills necessary for the content areas.

8. Record Keeping: Each elementary student has an individual Reading Progress Card in his permanent record folder. At the end of the school year entries are made on this card concerning basic materials read and teacher comments.

9. Parental Involvement: Parents assist in the reading program as teacher aides. Continuous educational programs are provided to help parents understand the reading program within the school and give them suggestions as to how to motivate their children at home.

10. Teacher Aides: Paraprofessional help is essential to our program. Elementary, high school, and college students, adults, both parents and non-parents, assist students one-to-one and in small groups.

Some special programs.....

- language experience in primary grades
- a daily fifteen minute reading time for everyone in the school including principal, faculty, secretary, students
- contracts for junior high students to read what interests them.

What is written without effort is in general read without pleasure.

Samuel Johnson

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EDUCATION HIGHLIGHTS of Governor Mills E. Godwin Jr.'s address to the General Assembly of Virginia on January 14, 1974:

" . . . Long ago, we abandoned the little red schoolhouse. Today there is evidence in some quarters that we may also have abandoned the efficiency with which the three R's were taught within its walls. And yet young people who cannot read, write or figure have little chance for success in life.

"I propose urgently that you promote throughout the commonwealth special programs to improve reading skills, without which little further learning can take place. Some of our own school divisions, many in other states, are already at work to find the best way of determining the cause of reading problems among specific students and of applying the most effective remedies. Your underlining of this vital necessity will stimulate more of our own people.

" . . . But along with the millions we must pour into the educational process at all levels, let us add a new measure of accountability. For years, we have asked the people of this state to contribute ever more heavily to the education of their children with no guarantee of results beyond a general promise of greater opportunity.

"With understanding that abilities and backgrounds vary, I believe our people are entitled to the assurance that their children will be able to read and write in accordance with their grade level, and that their report cards actually reflect a genuine grasp of the subject matter and the ability to use it, or if this is not the case, then specific reasons why any disparity exists and advice as to corrective measures which may be taken.

"We have accepted, as we should, responsibility for formulating standards of quality in education. It seems to me we cannot discharge that responsibility to the fullest unless we have a means of measuring whether those standards are in fact being met, in buildings, in equipment and in teaching performance.

"As we move out of a time of teacher shortages, I would hope that members of the teaching profession itself would lend their co-operation to school boards in developing personnel evaluation procedures for selecting and advancing individual teachers which reflect their ability in the classroom. . . ."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OUR EDUCATION: A report on the 1970 census

According to the 1970 census, approximately 60 million Americans enrolled in classes ranging from nursery school up to the postgraduate college level.

A greater proportion of Americans than ever before is going to school. We are starting school at an earlier age and staying in school longer. For the first time, the average American adult has completed high school. People who live in urban areas have a higher level of education than those in rural areas.

Although a higher percentage of whites finish high school than blacks or those of Spanish ancestry, these minorities are closing the gap. There is a definite relationship between level of education and the kinds of jobs people hold, and what they are paid.

Among the nativeborn of native parentage, 57 percent of whites, 31 percent of blacks, 33 percent of American Indians, and 56 percent of persons of other races have completed high school. Among the foreign-born, 36 percent of those from Europe, 32 percent of those from Mexico and Central and South America, and 46 percent of those from other countries have a high school education.

The more education a person has and the higher he is on the job ladder, the less likely he is to remain in his native state. In the population, 25 and older, only 38 percent of those with five or more years of college were living in the state of birth in both 1965 and 1970. In contrast, 52 percent of those with less than an elementary school education still lived in their home state.

Eight of 10 persons 20 and 21 years old have at least a high school education; among persons 30 to 34 years old, 69 percent had finished high school; among those 55-64 years old, 40 percent; and of those 75 years and older, only 24 percent had done so.

The Bureau of the Census has available a publication entitled We, The Americans: Our Education, one of a series of reports concerning the results of the 1970 census. The cost is 40¢. Send check or money order for 40¢, including your name and address, to Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Publications of the Bureau of the Census may also be ordered from any U.S. Department of Commerce District Office, one of which is located at 400 North 8th Street, Richmond, Virginia 23240.